

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-14, 17-20, 26-32 and 34-38 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 12 and 26 being independent. Claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 26, 31 and 32 have been amended. Claims 9, 15, 16 and 33 are canceled. Support for claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure at least at pages 11 and 12.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office stated that claims 9, 12 and 33 may be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. The §112, second paragraph rejection is discussed below and dependent claims 9 and 33 have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 26, respectively. Independent claims 1, 12 and 26 now stand allowable. During the afore-mentioned interview, Applicant understood the Office to tentatively agree. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication.

Claim Rejections under §112, First Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1-6, 8-20 and 26-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement for failing to describe subject matter in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention that was contained in the claims. Specifically, the independent claims recite “wherein the calculations that generate the one or more codes do not employ an encryption of M_2 .” Also, the Office assert that claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 31 and 32 recite that a message has a “pre-determined” length and this is not taught by the specification. For the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejections, Applicant’s attorney has revised independent claims 1, 12 and 26 and dependent claims 5, 6, 31 and 32. Claims 15 and 16 have been incorporated into independent claim 12 and are revised in that claim. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections under §112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1-6, 8-20 and 26-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the claims recite “the calculations do not employ an encryption of M_2 .” However, the claims recite that the variable k is used which in an encrypted

form of M₂. For the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant's attorney has revised independent claims 1, 12 and 26 to delete the reference to "employ[ing] an encryption of M₂." Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Objections

Claims 4 and 8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. For the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant's attorney has revised independent claim 1, which prior to its current amendment incorporated dependent claims 4 and 8. Therefore, claims 4 and 8 now further limit the subject matter of independent claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office withdraw the objection under 37 CFR 1.75(c).

Claim Rejections under §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over European Patent Application EP 1083700 (3/14/2001) (hereinafter "Pintsov") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,209,093 B1 (hereinafter "Venkatesan").

Claims 7-8, 11-14, 17-20, 26-28, 30, 33, 34, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over Pintsov in view of Venkatesan.

Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 29, 31, 32, 35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being obvious over Pintsov in view of Venkatesan.

As discussed above, Applicant herein amends independent claims 1 and 26 to incorporate allowable subject matter and overcome the §112 rejections. Applicant also herein amends claim 12 to overcome the §112 rejections. Furthermore, during the aforementioned interview, the amendments to the independent claims were discussed and Applicant understood the Office to tentatively agree that the amendments overcome the outstanding §103(a) rejections. Applicant thanks the Office for this indication.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims stand allowable.

Conclusion

All of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, **Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any remaining issues.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: August 18, 2008

By: /Dale G. Mohlenhoff/
Dale G. Mohlenhoff
Reg. No. 37,683
(509) 324-9256 ext. 238

Robert G. Hartman
Reg. No. 58,970
(509) 324-9256 ext. 265